III. Remarks:

This amendment is responsive to the **July 14, 2009** office action (the "Office Action"). Examination and reconsideration of **claims 1** and **3-11** is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

The **abstract** was objected to because it exceeded 150 words.

Claims 1-4 and **12** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kameda et al. (US Pat. No. 7,059,645) ("Kameda").

Claims 5-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended. Applicant does not believe the scope of the specification has been changed since the amendments relate to correcting the abstract in accordance with MPEP 608.01(b). No new matter has been added.

Amendments to the Claims

The claims have been amended. Applicant submits that support for these amendments can be found in the disclosure as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

The Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the Art of Record

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and **12** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kameda.

For a 35 U.S.C. §102 reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Section 2131 of the MPEP recites:

> A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 is directed to a robot hand including a plurality of finger mechanisms corresponding to a plurality of human fingers. The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kameda. (Office Action, P. 2, ¶ 3). However, Kameda does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element set forth in claim 1.

In particular, amended claim 1 recites a rotation driving mechanism that causes a first finger mechanism corresponding to a human thumb among said finger mechanisms to rotate by a predetermined angle about a center line extending in a direction where the phalange sections constituting said first finger mechanism are arranged so that said first finger mechanism is fully facing the other finger mechanisms. The Office Action cites Kameda, Figures 1 and 3 as teaching the claim limitation. However, Kameda does not teach the claim feature. In particular, Kameda does not teach causing a first finger mechanism corresponding to a human thumb

> to rotate by a predetermined angle about a center line extending in a direction where the phalange sections constituting said first finger mechanism are arranged so that said first finger mechanism is fully facing the other finger mechanisms.

The Office Action indicates that at least one finger in Kameda rotates about a "rotating shaft 61" and "shaft/actuators allow the fingers to rotate face to face." (Office Action, P. 4). Finger unit 11 rotates about shaft 61. (Kameda, Fig. 3). If we take finger unit 11 to be the first finger mechanism of claim 1, finger unit 11 must be able rotate about a center line extending in a direction where the phalange sections constituting finger unit 11 are arranged so that finger unit 11 is fully facing the other fingers.

However, Kameda discloses that one end of the turning plate 8 is fixed to the rotating shaft 61, and the articulated finger unit 11 is fixed to the other end of the turning plate 8 so that the articulated finger unit 11 can turn from an upper end position 11A adjacent to the articulated finger unit 5 to a lower side position 11B (shown by mistake in Kameda Fig. 3 as 12B), which is rotated 120 degrees. (Kameda, Fig 3). Neither position 11A, nor position 11B, nor positions in between place the phalange sections constituting finger unit 11 to be arranged so that finger unit 11 is fully facing the other fingers. Finger unit 11 never fully faces finger unit 5. Articulated finger unit 11 cannot fully face the articulated finger unit 5 because in position 11A, finger unit 11 is adjacent finger unit 5, and in position 11B, finger unit 11 is at 30 degree angle from finger unit 5. (Kameda, Fig. 3).

The axis line of the rotating shaft 61 of Kameda is not "a center line extending in a direction where the phalange sections constituting said first finger mechanism are arranged so that said first finger mechanism is fully facing the other finger mechanisms." Thus, Kameda does not expressly or inherently describe the claim limitation.

For at least these reasons, Kameda does not anticipate claim 1 as amended. The prior art cited does not teach all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art.

Claims 3-11 depend from claim 1, which has been shown to patentably distinguish over the prior art. For at least this reason, claims 3-11 also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Conclusion:

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that **claims 1** and **3-11** patentably distinguish over the references of record and are therefore allowable. If the Examiner believes that a telephone call will be helpful to further address any issues, please call the practitioner at the telephone number below.

Together with this submission, Applicant submits the statutory fees for a two-month extension of time and believes that no additional fees are due at this time. If there are any other fees due in relation to submittal of this communication, please charge to deposit account No. 02-2051, docket No. 30761-4.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 14, 2009

/ Luis A. Carrion /
Luis A. Carrion (Reg. No. 61,255)
(216) 363-4635
Benesch Friedlander Coplan & Aronoff LLP
200 Public Square, Suite 2300
Cleveland, OH 44114-2378